

## A TIME-LY HINT.

The young man's time to buy,  
The boy's time for new clothing,  
The parents' time to provide  
For the little ones is NOW  
Our stock is large and varied,  
Prices low, and every thing else:  
Well timed to please the purchaser.

## "The Waterbury."



Will still give the Im-  
portant Waterbury Watch  
and Chain to every CASH  
PURCHASER of \$12 worth  
and over.

B. ROBINSON & CO.,  
MEN'S, BOY'S AND CHILDREN'S CLOTHING AND FURNISHINGS,  
909 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE.

Having disposed of our COKE BUSINESS to  
Messrs. Johnson Bros.,  
We commend them to our customers, and bespeak for them a  
liberal patronage. Orders for COKE will be received at this  
office as heretofore. We continue to make a specialty of

GAS STOVES  
For both Cooking and Heating purposes, and are now offering  
bargains in HEATING STOVES to make room for Summer  
goods. A well selected stock of STOVES constantly on hand.  
The Washington Gaslight Co.KNABE  
PIANOS,  
Unequaled in Tone, Touch, Work-  
manship, and Durability.

Special attention of Purchasers invited to the  
New Artistic Styles, finished in designs of  
highest

## DECORATIVE ART.

SECOND-HAND PIANOS, a fine assortment  
of prominent makes at all prices.

## Pianos for Rent.

WM. KNABE & CO.,  
317 MARKET SPACE.

CHICKERING  
PIANOS.

W. G. Metzger & Co.,  
903 PA. AVE.

THE LEADING IN-  
STRUMENTS.

DECKER  
BROTHERS

WEBER, ESTEY, and FISCHER  
PIANOS.

ESTEY ORGANS.  
PIANOS FOR RENT.

SANDERS & STAYMAN  
934 F Street Northwest.

18 North Charles Street, Baltimore.

## STEARNS

Edward F. Droop,  
925 Pennsylvania Avenue,

Sole Agent for Stearns & Sons, Gabel, Decker  
& Son, Marshall & Wendell, Haller & Cum-  
son, and other Piano, Stringing Organs, Music  
and Musical Merchandise.

Instruments sold on monthly payments, ex-  
changed, rented, tuned, repaired, moved,  
stored, and shipped.

New and second-hand Pianos at other makes  
always in stock at low figures.

Telephone, 247-2.

The Oldest and Largest Music  
House in the City.

MILLER  
PIANOS.

MASON & HAMLIN  
ORGANS.

Catalogues free on application. Telephone  
No. 18.

JOHN F. ELLIS & CO.,  
CURE FITS!

No. 937 Pa. Ave., N. W.

## LADIES' GOODS.

Mrs. Annie E. Humphrey  
430 TENTH STREET N. W.,  
MAKES CORSETS TO ORDER  
Every style and material, and guarantees  
perfect fit and comfort.  
For specifications see French Hand-made Cor-  
sets, Corset Makers, and French Imports.

## ASKIE'S LOAN OFFICE.

No. 361 PENNA AVE. N. W.

Money loaned on Gold and Silver Watches,  
Diamonds, Jewelry, Platin, Gems, Me-  
chanical Tools, Lamps, and Gen-  
eral.

## STRONG CONTRADICTIONS

SHOWN IN THE TESTIMONY IN THE  
ANNEY CASE.

Backing Up the Reputation of Wit-  
nesses—Mrs. Angney Displays Ten-  
per on the Stand—Will not Never  
Owe Her a Cent at Any Time.

Over a week has now been spent by the  
criminal court in trying Jacob P. Angney  
on two indictments charging him with as-  
sault to kill, and the indications are that  
the present week will be the last in which  
the jury will receive the case for their con-  
sideration. The hearing has occupied con-  
siderable more time than was anticipated when  
the trial was entered upon, and it has now  
reached the stage where it cannot be con-  
sidered. When the court opened yesterday  
morning the government resumed the giving  
of its rebuttal testimony, and with the  
exception of a little amplification of evi-  
dence on the part of the defense, occupied  
the entire day.

F. Droop was the first witness  
called to prove the reputation of Turnbull  
for peace and good order, which the prose-  
cution called upon to do on the ground  
that it had been attacked by witnesses from  
Paterson, N. J.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

Objection was made to the introduction  
of the evidence by the defense, they claim-  
ing that the man's reputation at that time  
might have been the same as in 1882.

## FLAG PRESENTATION

From the Montgomery Grays to the  
Washington Light Infantry Corp.

The army of the Light Infantry Corps  
was last night well filled by the members  
and friends of the command, and a most  
interesting occasion it proved to be. When  
the Montgomery Grays, of Alabama, visited  
here in the summer of 1885 they were the  
guests of the corps and handsomely enter-  
tained. The Grays, who were then com-  
manded by Captain Montgomery, were re-  
ceived upon returning home they decided  
to give the corps some recognition of it  
at the same time further cement the good  
feeling which had been inaugurated between  
the two organizations. It was decided that  
a handsome flag United States flag should  
be given and the presentation take place  
when the Grays visited here in May to  
participate in the National Drill. Satura-  
day evening the attention of the corps and  
drill the flag was sent on, and the following  
letter to Col. Moore was the first knowledge  
given that anything of the kind had been  
contemplated.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., APR. 21, 1887.—Dear Sir:  
I have sent by express to-day to Capt. Jas.  
Baumgardner (as is the case with the com-  
mand) one handsome flag, complete, from  
the Montgomery Grays, of Alabama, to be  
presented to the Washington Light Infantry  
Corps, which we beg to accept as a slight token of our ap-  
preciation of the friendly relations which  
our company during its visit to Washington  
last summer have enjoyed with yours. We  
trust that the flag will be a source of in-  
crease of the pleasure of presenting it in person  
during the National Drill and Encampment to  
be held in your city in May, but in the event  
it is not possible to do so, we trust that the  
flag will be a source of pleasure to you  
and your company. With kindest regards for  
you and your company, I am, Sir, very re-  
spectfully,  
M. H. ARMSTRONG,  
Captain Commanding Montgomery Grays.

The flag is handsomely designed and  
bears the motto "DIE WITH DUTY." It was  
presented to the Washington Light Infantry  
Corps by the Montgomery Grays, of Mont-  
gomery, Ala., May 18, 1887.

Capt. Joseph Baumgardner in a few well  
chosen words made the presentation, which  
was warmly responded to in his usual happy  
manner.

ALEXANDRIA MATTERS.

Items of Interest Gathered for the  
"Republican" Readers.

The Alexandria Church Choral Union will  
give their second annual concert at the  
opera house Friday evening. They will be  
assisted by Miss Edna Gray, of New York  
city, and Mr. Warren S. Young, of Wash-  
ington.

Business at Flabtown was not very heavy  
yesterday. The receipts were 100,000 her-  
ring, 100,000 and a few hush fish. The  
herring sold at \$2.50 to \$3.00 and about  
\$12 to \$15.

Mr. John T. Sweeney has been elected  
member of the board of directors of the  
city of Alexandria. He was elected by the  
board, and will take office on May 1st.

Smoot collected \$2 in his court  
yesterday, the penalty inflicted upon two  
unfortunate individuals, one for an assault  
upon a small boy, the other for sleeping in  
the street.

The Alexandria Mutual Association last  
night gave a ball to their young lady  
friends. The affair was a success, and the  
proceeds of the ball will be used for the  
benefit of the association.

Another of the old landmarks has passed  
away. The old building of the Alexandria  
east corner of Cameron and Patrick streets  
was yesterday torn down preparatory to  
the erection of a handsome residence by  
Mr. Fred. Rogers. The building has stood  
on this site for nearly eighty years.

The paper chase will come off this after-  
noon, if the weather is favorable.

THE ICE CREAM STOLEN.

Which Compeled "Squire" Mills to  
Guests to Do Without.

Judge Samuel C. Mills had a party last  
night in honor of a member of his family,  
and his house, 128 E. street northwest, was  
filled with friends, music, and pleasant  
chat, and a merrier gathering could not  
have been found in any other home in the  
city. The esteemed judge had taken time  
by the forelock and provided bountifully  
in the way of refreshments for his guests.  
When the hour came for refreshments  
everything in course was put before his  
friends, and the party enjoyed it very much.  
"My, my, Mr. Mills, where is the ice cream  
freer?" said the servant girl. "It is not out  
there," replied the judge. "It is in the back  
yard." "Did you look good?"

"Yes, sir," replied the judge. "I put it there  
myself. I will get it and see."

Mr. Mills did look, but the ice cream  
freer was gone. Some one had been in  
to it, and the guests had to go without the  
dainty.

Thanks to President Cleveland.

A largely attended meeting of the  
Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the  
District was held at Central Union Hall  
rooms yesterday afternoon. Mrs. La  
Fetra presided, and Mrs. Justice Weaver  
read the report of the district. The meeting  
was presided over by Mrs. Justice Weaver,  
and the report of the district was read by  
Mrs. Justice Weaver. The meeting was  
held in the afternoon, and the report of the  
district was read by Mrs. Justice Weaver.

The letter from Mr. Wilnot to Jonas  
Note, written in October, 1885, was shown to  
the witness, and he testified that it was  
his, and that it was written by him. This  
testimony was objected to and ordered to  
be struck out.

Mrs. Angney, speaking of her first visit  
to this city, said that she came here in 1879,  
remained with her sister some five or six  
weeks, and was then married by Mr. Wilnot.  
The next time she came to this city, she  
remained some weeks; she was com-  
municated to her husband, and he told her  
that she was a thief, and that she had stolen  
his money.

The government announced that it had  
been decided to examine the evidence in re-  
lational and he would be this morning.

Mrs. Angney was called back to the stand  
for further cross-examination by the de-  
fense. She testified that she knew James E.  
Slade, of Columbia, Pa., but denied that,  
in January, 1882, she told him that all her  
money was in the name of her husband, and  
left his throat as beautifully healed as  
it could be.

Since then I have used S. S. S. in numerous  
cases in my practice, and I have never failed  
to make a safe, perfect, and permanent cure,  
where the patients have followed your direc-  
tions.

It is because of these remarkable cures that  
I have made it my own practice with S. S. S.  
that I cheerfully send you this testimony of  
my success in all such cases.

It is because of these remarkable cures that  
I have made it my own practice with S. S. S.  
that I cheerfully send you this testimony of  
my success in all such cases.

It is because of these remarkable cures that  
I have made it my own practice with S. S. S.  
that I cheerfully send you this testimony of  
my success in all such cases.

It is because of these remarkable cures that  
I have made it my own practice with S. S. S.  
that I cheerfully send you this testimony of  
my success in all such cases.

It is because of these remarkable cures that  
I have made it my own practice with S. S. S.  
that I cheerfully send you this testimony of  
my success in all such cases.

It is because of these remarkable cures that  
I have made it my own practice with